

Remarks/Arguments

In the September 7, 2005 office action, claims 11 and 18 were rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by Akgulian et al (US Patent No. 3,731,469). Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning (US Patent No. 1,957,079) in view of Akgulian et al (US Patent No. 3,613,337). Claim 3 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning and Akgulian '337, and further in view of Bednar et al (US Patent No. 6,336,312). Claims 19 and 22 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over McNutt (US Patent No. 1,562,709) in view of Johnson (US Patent No. 3,177,638). Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akgulian in view of Ronning. Claim 13 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akgulian et al in view of Worthington (US Patent No. 1,330,293). Claim 15 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akgulian in view of Hornung (US Patent No. 6,684,616). Claim 16 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akgulian in view of Gerzanich (US Patent No. 4,341,059). Claim 17 was rejected under section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akgulian in view of Speiser (US Patent No. 3,410,063).

Claims 20 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response to the final office action, claims 1, 11, 12 and 19 are amended. Claims 4, 16, 14 and 20 are cancelled.

Claim 1 is amended to specify the pair of rear wheels are driven by a power supply at least partially behind the pair of rear wheels. As amended, claim 1 is patentable over Ronning in view of Akgulian '337. Ronning and Akgulian fail to show a pair of rear wheels driven by a power supply at least partially behind the pair of rear wheels.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 7-10 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 11 is amended to specify one of the cutting units in the center row positioned between the left rail and the right rail. As amended, claim 11 is

patentable over Akgulian '469. Akgulian '469 shows cutting unit 11 in the second row positioned underneath vehicle chassis members 10.

Claims 12-13 and 15-18 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 11.


Claim 19 is amended to specify one cutting unit being positioned entirely between the pair of rails in the mowing position. As amended, claim 19 is patentable over McNutt in view of Johnson. McNutt and Johnson fail to show a cutting unit being positioned entirely between a pair of rails in the mowing position.

Claim 22 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,



Attorney for Applicant(s)

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Stephen D. Dellett
Reg. No. 32,564
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4232

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on: 11/7/05
Date

Deere & Company
Kelly M. Leary 11/7/05
Signature Date